IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PENDLETON DIVISION

FRED LEO TOQUERO,

Case No. 2:14-cv-00212-TC **ORDER**

Plaintiff,

VS.

B. AMBSBERRY, Acting Superintendent EOCI,

Defendant.

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Coffin filed his Findings and Recommendation ("F&R") (doc. 76) on 9/25/2017. The matter is now before me. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72. No objections have been timely filed. Although this relieves me of my obligation to perform a de novo review, I retain the obligation to "make an informed, final decision." Britt v. Simi Valley Unified Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983), overruled on other grounds, United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). The Magistrates Act does not specify a standard of review in cases where no objections are filed. Ray v. Astrue, 2012 WL 1598239, *1 (D. Or. May 7, 2012). Following the recommendation of the Rules Advisory

Committee, I review the F&R for "clear error on the face of the record[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note (1983) (citing *Campbell v. United States District Court*, 501 F.2d 196, 206 (9th Cir. 1974)); see also United States v. Vonn, 535 U.S. 55, 64 n.6 (2002) (stating that, "[i]n the absence of a clear legislative mandate, the Advisory Committee Notes provide a reliable source of insight into the meaning of" a federal rule). Having reviewed the file of this case, I find no clear error.

Accordingly I adopt Judge Coffin's F&R (doc. 76) in its entirety. The Petitions for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. 2, 27, 50) are DENIED, and this case is DISMISSED with prejudice. A Certificate of Appealability is denied on the basis that petitioner has not made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

Dated this 8th day of November 2017.

Ann Aiken

United States District Judge